## REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended to clarify the claim language. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 7,225,247 ("Kenndy") in view of USPP 2003/0069975 ("Abjanic") and USP 5,920,566 ("Hendel"). Claims 31 to 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 31-33 have been cancelled in favor of the amendments to independent claims 1, 11 and 21.

## I. Rejection to Claims 1-30

## A. Rejection to Independent Claims 1, 11 and 21

The Applicant first turn to the Examiner's objection to Applicant's claims 31-30. Regarding claims 31-33, the Examiner states the following in the Final Office Action (see page 33):

"Claims 31-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: As per claims 31-33, a thorough review of the prior art fails to disclose or render obvious "overwriting said header portion, said first identifier with said third identifier located within said modified at least one packet, by said common switch"

The Applicant has accordingly incorporated the limitations of dependent claims

31, 32 and 33 into independent claims 1, 11 and 21, respectively. Consequently, dependent claims 31-33 have been cancelled. The Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are now in condition for allowance based on at least the following reasons.

The combination of Kennedy, Abjanic and Hendel at least does not disclose or suggest "overwriting within said header portion of modified at least one packet, said first identifier with said third identifier located within said modified at least one packet, by using said common switch." as recited in Applicant's claims 1, 11 and 21.

## B. Dependent Claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 11 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kennedy, Abjanic and Hendel has been overcome and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 1-30.

Application No 10/648,004 Reply to Final Office Action of 12/21/2010

CONCLUSION

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all claims 1-30 are in

condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, the Applicant respectfully requests a

telephone interview, and request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Patent

Agent at (312) 775-8093.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit

any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account

No. 13-0017.

A Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 14, 2011

/Frankie W. Wong/

Frankie W. Wong Registration No. 61,832 Patent Agent for Applicant

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd. 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60661 (312) 775-8093 (FWW)

Page 15 of 15